DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 360 718 EA 025 165

AUTHOR Siskind, Theresa G.; And Others
TITLE An Evaluation of In-School Suspension Programs.
PUB DATE Feb 93
NOTE 36p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Eastern Educational Research Association (Clearwater Beach, FL, February 1993).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Probation; *Discipline Policy; *Discipline Problems; Elementary Secondary Education; *In School Suspension; Program Evaluation; Public Schools; *Student Behavior; Student Motivation
IDENTIFIERS *Berkeley County School District SC

ABSTRACT

Findings of a study that determined the effectiveness of the Berkeley County (South Carolina) in-school suspension (ISS) program are presented in this paper. Methodology involved personal interviews conducted with the ISS director and ISS teacher in 8 middle and 8 high schools in the county, a total of 16 principals and 16 teachers. Findings indicate that there is not uniformity across the programs, although most employ techniques suggested by the literature. Programs are more punitive than therapeutic, counseling is not used systematically, and additional inservice training is needed. Minor discrepancies existed between the views of directors and teachers, who differed in their perceptions of the degree of authoritarianism in the student-teacher relationship. Finally, the study was unable to isolate program characteristics that relate to student behavior in the ISS classroom. It is recommended that the district conduct a regular annual program evaluation and a midyear formative evaluation. One table is included. Appendices contain the interview guides. (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 360 718

An Evaluation of In-School Suspension Programs

Theresa G. Siskind, Ph.D.
The Citadel
Charleston, SC 29409
(803) 792-5018

Gary Leonard, Ph.D.
Berkeley County (SC) School District

Mark Carnucci
Meredith Gibson
Julius Jeng
Alda Nevarre
Philip Wertz

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Eastern Educational Research Association, Clearwater Beach, Florida, February 18, 1993.

EA 025 165

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

T. Siskind

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

An Evaluation of In-School Suspension Programs

In-school suspension (ISS) programs have been touted as an alternative to out-of-school suspension because they keep students in school and involved in school activities (Patterson, 1985; Stessman, 1985). One hope is that ISS programs will help reduce the dropout rate (Johnston, 1989). If, however, ISS programs merely provide a different location for students to perpetuate disruptive, non-academic behaviors, they do not provide a purposeful alternative.

With such a possibility in mind, the Berkeley County (SC) ISS program was evaluated. The evaluation had three major foci. First, how do the district's ISS programs compare to "model" ISS programs? Second, to what extent do program plans and implementation match? And, third, what are the effects of selected program characteristics on student behavior in the ISS classroom?

A Comparison of Berkeley County ISS to "Model" Programs

A review of relevant literature indicates that successful ISS programs are academically-oriented (Patterson, 1985; Rentz, 1991). Students are held accountable for their regular classroom assignments while in ISS. The ISS monitor and regular classroom teacher work collaboratively (Corbett, 1981; Montgomery County Public Schools, 1981; North Carolina State Department of Public Instruction, 1986; North Carolina State Department of Public Instruction, 1987; Thomas County Schools, 1991; Weiss, 1983).

According to the NC Department of Public Instruction (1986) and Opuni (1991), the monitor should be certified - preferably in social work, counseling or school psychology - and have expertise in classroom management. The monitor should be assigned a limited number of students (North Carolina State Department of Public Instruction, 1986; Opuni, 1991).

On-going staff development and training should be provided to monitors as well as other faculty, administrators, and parents (North Carolina State Department of Public Instruction, 1986; North Carolina State Department of Public Instruction, 1987). Inclusion of parents is considered essential to the effectiveness of ISS programs (Collins, 1985; Myers, 1985; North Carolina State Board of Education, 1986; North Carolina State Department of Public Instruction, 1987; Opuni, 1991; Thomas County Schools, 1991).

As far as the operation of ISS, a key component is isolation (Collins, 1985; Montgomery County Public Schools, 1981; North Carolina State Department of Education, 1986; North Carolina State Department of Public Instruction, 1987; Opuni, 1991; Patterson, 1985; Weiss, 1983). ISS students should be isolated from the regular school body. The ISS classroom should be in a location separate from regular classrooms. Students in the ISS classroom should be separated from one another by study carrels or other types of dividers. ISS students should eat lunch apart from other students and should not be allowed to participate in extra-curricular activities.

To ensure the punitive effects of ISS, assignment should be made as soon after the offense as possible (North Carolina State Department of Public Instruction, 1986) by the school disciplinarian (Elliot, 1991). Complete documentation is essential (Corbett, 1981).

Whereas, isolation and firm discipline help maintain the punitive aspects of ISS, counseling students is an important therapeutic function (Collins, 1985; Grosenick & Huntze, 1984; North Carolina State Board of Education, 1986; North Carolina State Department of Public Instruction, 1987; Opuni, 1991; Thomas County Schools, 1991). Coping and social skills counseling (Grosenick & Huntze, 1984) may be delivered through self-help packets (Stessman, 1985) as well as tutoring, individual and group counseling (Collins, 1985).

In addition to self-help packets and appropriate documentation, the ISS classroom should be equipped with a telephone (North Carolina State Department of Public Instruction, 1986) and other typical classroom equipment (e.g., paper, pencils, audio-visual equipment) (Opuni, 1991).

Procedures. To determine the extent to which Berkeley County Schools incorporate effective practice in their ISS programs, an interview protocol was developed (Appendix A) and administered in the middle and high schools in Berkeley County. The interview protocol consisted of 45 items derived from the literature. Questions were reviewed by the panel of researchers and other Berkeley County administrators and revised twice before finalization.

Five of the researchers interviewed the appropriate school administrator (director of ISS) in 16 schools. At three of the schools, teams of two researchers were used to check for inter-rater reliability. Agreement between interviewers was 93%.

Sample. The Berkeley County School District is a rapidly growing school system located near the coastal area of Charleston. The district serves a county which has a population of 125,000 and a geographical area of 1110 square miles. Berkeley County includes both rural and suburban areas. The 37 schools serve a student population of 28,450. Included in this population is the largest navy housing unit in the United States.

Berkeley County has eight middle schools and eight high schools. Six of the high schools serve grades 9-12; two include grades 7-12. Three of the middle schools serve grades 6-8 while five include grades 5-8. Each of these schools operates an ISS program directed by a principal or assistant principal. Of the directors, 14 were male and 2 were female (7 male, 1 female for both middle and high schools).

Analysis and Findings. Rather than present the raw data for each question on the protocol, a summary of responses will be provided for the points outlined in the literature review and for selected questions. Please note, a copy of the tabulation of

responses is available from the authors.

Academic Orientation of ISS. In all of the high schools and all but one of the middle schools, students were responsible for their regular classwork while serving time in ISS. At both levels, the directors were split in their opinions about whether or not ISS teachers receive adequate input from regular teachers. In all of the middle schools and all but one of the high schools, regular teachers were notified when a student was assigned ISS.

Certification and Training of ISS Teacher/Monitors. As mentioned elsewhere in this report, only three of the monitors, all at the high school level, are certified teachers. Only one of the middle school monitors has a college degree. Although inservice training is provided by many of the schools in the areas of discipline, counseling, work assignment, parental involvement, coordination among involved parties, physical arrangement of ISS, and lunch, most of the directors thought that additional training is needed in all areas except coordination and possibly lunch (where the response was split).

The predominant characteristic that directors seek in hiring an ISS monitor is the ability to discipline. Directors also reported (in descending order of frequency) counseling ability, authoritarianism, certification, experience with students, and energy.

Most of the schools viewed the ISS student-teacher ratio as acceptable most of the time.

Parental Involvement. At both levels, parents are notified that their child has been assigned to ISS. At the high school level, all parents are notified by letter prior to ISS assignment. Five of the eight schools telephoned parents as well. At the middle school level, the majority of schools contact parents by telephone, using a letter only when parents can not be reached. Seven of the middle schools notify parents before ISS assignment; one contacts parents afterward.

Isolation. All of the middle schools ensure that ISS classrooms are in locations separate from other classrooms. Most of the high schools isolate students, but in at least one case a hallway is used. Four of the high schools and seven of the middle schools physically separate students from one another in ISS. (Please note that this was confirmed by observational data as indicated in the third section of this paper.) At each level, four schools separate their ISS students from one another during lunch. (Please note that directors' responses on this item differ from those of teachers as indicated in following section of this paper.) All schools separate ISS from regular students during lunch although in three high schools and five middle schools ISS students eat lunch at the same time as regular students. Whereas the middle schools do not allow their ISS students to attend school activities, three of the high schools allow ISS students to participate in social and academic activities during regular school hours.

Referral and Placement in ISS. At both the middle and high school levels, referrals came primarily from teachers and

principals. At the middle school level, principals were more active than assistant principals. The reverse was true at the high school level. In no case did parents make a referral, and in only one middle school did guidance counselors refer.

In both the middle and high schools, the final decision for ISS placement rested primarily with the principal and assistant principal. In two middle schools, teachers also made this decision.

In all the middle schools, students were placed in ISS on the day following the violation. In six of the high schools, next day placement was used. Two schools based placement on availability of space in the ISS room.

All of the high schools document the ISS placement process, but only four of the middle schools do so.

Counseling and Therapy. The primary types of counseling employed with ISS students were one-on-one and group counseling provided by the guidance counselor. High schools supplemented guidance counseling with the ISS monitor and guest speakers, while middle schools used administrators to provide additional counseling. In all cases the guidance counselors are state certified. A variety of counseling philosophies prevails, with no one dominating.

Four of the high schools and one of the middle schools utilize self-help programs.

ISS Classroom Equipment. Two of the high schools had no communication device in the ISS classroom. All of the middle schools had such a device. The types of devices varied from intercom to buzzer to radio. Only one middle school had a phone in the classroom. (Please note that telephone information was confirmed with the classroom observations.)

Three of the high schools and one middle school made no resources available to ISS students. Of the remainder, one or more schools made available reference material, televisions, VCRs, computers, books, and library privileges.

Length of Time in ISS. All schools indicated that one day was the minimum assignment to ISS. All schools except one high school differentiated the number of days assigned to ISS by seriousness of offense. The maximum number of days spent in ISS per offense ranged from 1 to 5, with three and five days being the most popular maximums. Among the high schools, six limited the number of times a student could visit ISS in a year, and two limited the number of days. At the middle school level, two schools limited the number of visits to ISS during the school year but none limited the number of days.

Evaluation and Reporting. Among the high schools, three indicated that they made monthly reports about ISS to the district office, three said they made yearly reports, one provides a quarterly report, and one only reports upon request. At the middle school level the figures were one weekly, one quarterly, two twice a year, three yearly, one never.

How Well Do Plans and Programs Match?

In 1981, Corbett indicated that a difficulty in studying ISS programs derived from the discrepancy between the conceptualization of the program and the implementation. In the current study, this notion was operationalized as the difference between the director's view of the program and the teacher/monitor's view of the program.

Procedures. To gather the teachers' opinions, another interview schedule was developed. The 19 questions included in this protocol were a subset of questions from the Principal Survey which district officials believed to be most pertinent to teachers. A copy of the Teacher Survey is included in Appendix B.

Five of the researchers interviewed the teachers in the 16 schools. Teacher interviews were conducted independent from the principal interviews administered earlier in the day. In three of the schools, teams of two researchers were utilized to check for inter-rater agreement. One interviewer asked the questions, and both researchers recorded the answers separately. For the Teacher Survey, inter-rater agreement was 94%.

Sample. The eight middle school ISS teachers and eight high school ISS teachers in Berkeley County comprised the sample. At the high school level, three teachers were male and one was female. At the middle school level, one teacher was male and seven were female. At the high school level, three ISS teachers were reported as state certified teachers, four were credentialed as aides, and one was classified as a substitute. One teacher had also had experience as a minister. At the middle school level, none of the teachers was state certified. The only reported school experience was as a monitor. Only one school indicated the monitor had a college degree.

Analysis and Findings. To ascertain the amount of agreement between program directors and teacher/monitors, answers to the 19 questions common to both interviews were compared. A simple analysis of the percentage of agreement between the answers given by the directors and the monitors is given in Table 1. Percentages are reported for middle and high schools separately, as well as for the total group.

Insert Table 1 about here

The levels of agreement between director and monitor varied widely. In general the agreement was very high when the question addressed equipment or procedures used by ISS. However, this was not always true. For example, when asked if ISS students were separated from each other during lunch, there was agreement in only 11 of the 16 cases. Not unexpectedly, differences in opinion surfaced when philosophical questions were asked or program success was rated. One problem with the current analysis is that it does not take into account the degree of discrepancy on scaled items.

It is interesting to note, for example, that teachers and principals are in general agreement regarding inservice. Four, three, and nine teachers, respectively, view inservice as adequate, minimal, and inadequate. Among the principals, five, two, and nine hold these views.

The most serious disagreements appear to be over the question about lunch separation cited earlier and about a description of the teacher-student relationship as authoritarian (complete control, no questions asked), authoritative (control with explanation), or permissive (very little control). For this latter item, there was only 38% agreement at the high school level while the agreement at the middle school level was 75%. Overall five teachers (three high school and two middle school) viewed themselves as more authoritarian than their principals viewed them. Two high school teachers viewed the teacher-student relationship as more authoritative while the principals viewed it as authoritarian. Any explanation about differences in the degree of agreement between the two school levels would be purely speculative.

How Do Program Characteristics and Student Behavior Relate?

The Montgomery County Schools (1981) found that students overwhelmingly cite ISS as more punishing than out of school suspension. Yet, in order to be an effective rehabilitative as well as punitive alternative, ISS should provide an organized classroom setting (Leatt, 1987) with clear rules (Thomas County Schools, 1991).

Discipline within the ISS classroom may be a problem, however, because of an emphasis on independent, isolated work. There is evidence to suggest that extended periods of seatwork may contribute to behavior problems (Veir, 1989). Some indicators of discipline problems in a classroom are talking out of turn, talking with peers, disruptive movement out of seats, inattention and apathy (Napchen, 1988). Veir (1989) stresses the importance of not only a plan for discipline, but also inservice training in classroom management.

Procedures. To determine the relationship between program characteristics and student behavior, an observational approach was utilized. After interviewing the director of ISS and prior to interviewing the teacher/monitor, the researcher(s) observed within ISS classrooms for approximately one class period. While in the classroom, the researchers made a set of formal observations (as described in Instruments) as well as a set of exploratory observations. The exploratory observations were made in an attempt to derive hypotheses about which program characteristics were most important in terms of controlling in-class ISS behavior. Based on their school-based observations, the researchers determined that the teacher gender, the use of carrels, and the teacher discipline style (authoritarian v. authoritative) were the characteristics which appeared to greatest determinants of student behavior in the ISS classroom.

Instrument. The observation instrument consisted of two parts. In the first part, identifying information about the ISS classroom was gathered. These data included school name, date of observation, teacher gender, number of students in class, presence or absence of phone, intercom, carrels, and whether or not the teacher left the room during the class. The second part of the observation form listed nine off task behaviors: talking, out of seat without permission, making noise which disturbs others, touching other students, head down on desk, daydreaming or gazing around, playing with objects, ignoring the teacher when spoken to, ignoring teacher's directions to the class. An "Other" category was available on both parts of the observation instrument.

Student behavior was observed and recorded in nine intervals of five minutes each. Every instance of off-task behavior observed within the five minute interval was recorded by category and interval.

Like the principal interview and the teacher interview, behavioral observations were conducted by the five researchers. Three two-person teams were used to check inter-rater agreement. Agreement was checked as a percentage utilizing the categories, intervals, and total observations. Because there were only three teams, a single discrepancy greatly diminished the percentage of agreement. Therefore, correlations were also calculated. The correlation for total behaviors between observers was .994.

Percentage and correlational data yielded some common conclusions. Agreement between observers was generally high; however, the interval data provided some insight into the observation process. Agreement during the first interval was lower. It increased and stabilized until the last interval in which it dropped substantially. This pattern might be attributed to fading attentiveness by the observers or to the proximity to lunch time. (In one case, for example, the teacher distributed lunch tickets which contributed to some classroom disruption. One observer considered this as extenuating circumstances. The other viewed it as off-task behavior.) Another important factor to consider was differing perspectives of the classroom for the two observers who were not located in the same place.

Sample. Although 16 schools were visited, one did not have any students in ISS on the day of visitation. The resulting observations were made in eight middle schools and seven high schools. A total of 109 students was observed with ISS classes ranging in size from one to 19. The modal class size was three (four schools).

Of the 15 schools, four had male teacher/monitors and 11 had female teachers. Similarly, 11 schools utilized carrels or other dividers while four did not. According to the ISS directors, three programs used an authoritarian approach while 12 were authoritative. The teacher monitors classified the programs as authoritarian and authoritative, six and nine, respectively.

Analysis and Results. Teacher gender, presence or absence of carrels or dividers, director's view of teacher's discipline style (authoritative or authoritarian), and teacher's view of discipline style were analyzed as independent variables along with behavior data as the dependent variable. Behavior was analyzed for the total as well as the nine categories. None of the independent variables showed a significant main effect for any of the dependent variables. Nor were there significant interaction effects. When level of school was added to the analysis, similar results were found.

Data analysis may have been hampered by the limited number of subjects and/or observations as well as by the fact that there were a limited number of disruptions in the observed classes.

Conclusions

The purpose of the present study was to evaluate the Berkeley County ISS program by describing the programs employed by its eight middle and eight high schools, to determine whether or not there were differences in the conception and operation of the programs, and to attempt to isolate program characteristics which were effective in controlling ISS classroom behavior.

With respect to the Berkeley programs, in terms of the first question, results show that there is not uniformity across programs although most employ techniques suggested by the literature. Data indicate that the programs are more punitive than therapeutic, that counseling is not used systematically and does not have a consistent set of goals, and that additional inservice training is needed in a variety of areas.

As to the second question, data indicate that there are minor discrepancies between the views of directors and teachers. The most serious of these deals with the description of student-teacher relationship as authoritarian or authoritative. And, in terms of the third question, the present study was unable to isolate program characteristics which relate to student behavior in the ISS classroom.

Future evaluations of the Berkeley County program will address repeat offenders and attempt to determine causes of recidivism. The effects of future inservice training will also be assessed.

Like many other programs, the Berkeley County ISS programs are irregularly evaluated. Grosenick and Huntze (1984) suggest that ISS programs should be evaluated annually with at least one formative evaluation mid-year. The present study provides a framework for a partial evaluation, suggesting important questions to consider. It utilizes instruments, which while not perfect, could be adapted for use by districts. And, by its limitations, it warns of some pitfalls in evaluation.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

References

Collins, C. (1985). Turn around program: Helping children with behavior problem through in-school suspension. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 258 352)

Corbett, A. H. (1981). Is your ISS program meeting its goals? Take a closer look. NASSP Bulletin, 81(65), 59-63.

Elliot, W. L. (1991). Re-focus program - redefine efforts: Focus on change under supervision. (ERIC Document Reproduction No. ED 337 830)

Johnston, J. S. (1989). High school completion of ISS students. NASSP Bulletin, 73(521), 89-95.

Grosenick, J. K., & Huntze, S. L. (1984). Positive alternatives to the disciplinary exclusion of behaviorally disordered students. National needs analysis of behavior disorders. (ERIC Document Reproduction No. ED 249 668)

Leatt, D. J. (1987). In-school suspension programs for at-risk students. (ERIC Document Reproduction No. ED 282 279)

Montgomery County Public Schools (1981). A preliminary evaluation of the pilot in-school suspension program. (ERIC Document Reproduction No. ED 228 359)

Myers, J. W. (1985). Involving parents in middle level education. (ERIC Document Reproduction No. ED 260 515)

Napchen, S. (1988). Conferencing with individual students to gain insight and guide learning. (ERIC Document Reproduction No. ED 332 123)

North Carolina State Board of Education. (1986). The basic education program for North Carolina's public schools. (ERIC Document Reproduction No. ED 268 640)

North Carolina State Department of Public Instruction, Raleigh Division of Support Programs. (1986). Program guide for in-school suspension. (ERIC Document Reproduction No. ED 293 208)

North Carolina State Department of Public Instruction, Raleigh Division of Support Programs. (1987). Keeping students in school: A handbook for dropout prevention. (ERIC Document Reproduction No. ED 293 051)

Opuni, K. (1991). Student assignment centers: An in-school suspension program. (ERIC Document Reproduction No. ED 339 137)

Patterson, F. (1985). In-school suspension rehabilitates offenders. NASSP Bulletin, 69, 97-99.

Rentz, R. D. (1991). The development and implementation of an ISS program. (ERIC Document Reproduction No. ED 339 103)

Stessman, C. W. (1985). In-school suspension. Making it a place to grow. NASSP Bulletin, 69, 86-88.

Thomas County Schools. (1991). In-school suspension program. (ERIC Document Reproduction No. ED 336 826)

Veir, C. (1989). Managing students: Techniques for preventing off-task behavior. A staff development/inservice training packet based upon the Texas teacher appraisal. (ERIC Document Reproduction No. ED 333 542)

Weiss, K. (1983). In-school suspension--time to work, not socialize. NASSP Bulletin, 67(464), 132-133.

Table 1

Percentage of Agreement Between ISS Directors and Teacher/Monitors

Item	Middle School	High School	Total
1	88	88	88
2	100	100	100
3	100	100	100
4	75	63	69
5	88	100	94
6	88	100	94
7	75	88	81
8	100	100	100
9	100	100	100
10	75	63	69
11	100	100	100
12	88	38	63
13	75	38	56
14	63	63	63
15	75	75	75
16	38	0	19
17	75	63	69
18	38	88	63
19	50	50	50

APPENDIX A

PRINCIPAL SURVEY-INTERVIEW COVER SHEET

SCHOOL NAME:_____

NAME OF PRINCIPAL BEING INTERVIEWED:_____

CHECK ONE: _____VICE PRINCIPAL _____PRINCIPAL _____OTHER

DATE:_____ TIME OF DAY STARTED:_____

TIME OF DAY COMPLETED:_____

SCHEDULING AND DIRECTIONS

DATE(S) APPOINTMENT SET UP:_____

TIME(S) OF DAY APPOINTMENT SET UP:_____

PERSON(S) CONTACTED TO SET APPOINTMENT_____

APPOINTMENT: DAY_____ START TIME_____

APPROXIMATE COMPLETION TIME_____ DATE_____

HOW LONG WILL IT TAKE TO GET THERE:_____

DIRECTIONS:_____

APPENDIX B

TEACHER/MONITOR SURVEY COVER SHEET

SCHOOL NAME:_____

NAME OF MONITOR BEING SURVEYED:_____

DATE:_____ TIME OF DAY STARTED:_____

TIME OF DAY COMPLETED:_____

SCHEDULING AND DIRECTIONS

DATE(S) APPOINTMENT SET UP:_____

TIME(S) OF DAY APPOINTMENT SET UP:_____

PERSON(S) CONTACTED TO SET APPOINTMENT_____

APPOINTMENT: DAY_____ START TIME_____

APPROXIMATE COMPLETION TIME_____ DATE_____

HOW LONG WILL IT TAKE TO GET THERE:_____

DIRECTIONS:_____

PRINCIPAL SURVEY

1. Who is responsible for the referral of the student to ISS?

   teachers_____
   guidance counselors_____
   assistant principal_____
   principal_____
   parents_____
   other_____

2. Who makes the decision that the student will attend ISS?

   teachers_____
   guidance counselors_____
   assistant principal_____
   principal_____
   parents_____
   other_____

3. Are parents notified that their child is assigned to ISS?

   yes_____ no_____
   If yes, how?
   phone_____ letter____

4. Are parents notified before or after the student attends ISS?

   before ISS_____ after ISS_____

5. How is placement in ISS documented? Is there an agreement between the school and the parent?

   * At this time make arrangements to collect documentation paper work.

6. Please list the offenses for a student to be placed in ISS.

7. How soon after a student commits a violation is he placed into ISS?

8. Does the nature of the offense determine the priority in which the student is placed in ISS? If yes, please give an example.

9. Are the ISS students responsible for their regular classroom assignments? If no, specify the type of work the student is given to do during ISS.

10. Please describe any self-help programs you administer to your students in ISS.

11. Are there any audio or visual aides provided for the ISS students? Please indicate which type.

12. Which type of counseling best typifies what a typical student assigned to ISS receives in your school?

_____none _____group with other ISS students

_____one on one _____other:_____

_____group

Who does this counseling or guidance?

_____ISS monitor

_____school counselor

_____other:_____

_____N/A

What are the qualifications of the person doing this counseling, regarding education and training?

Please list any other positions or responsibilities held by this person in other areas in the school. Please describe.

_____P.E. teacher _____

_____classroom teacher (list subjects)_____

_____school counselor_____

_____other (ie: coaching, teacher aide, etc.) _____

Describe the philosophy/method of counseling used.

13. What type of experience and education does your ISS staff have for the following functions:

monitoring:

directing/administration:

14. Are the students in the ISS program physically separated from each other? If yes, what is the separation device?

15. Are the students in ISS allowed to attend school activities and programs featured on or off the school campus?

16. Are the above programs and activities during school?

17. Please check the type of activity.

social_____

academic_____

18. Are the ISS students separated from each other during lunch?

19. Are the ISS students separated from the non-ISS students during lunch?

20. Do the ISS students eat prior to, during, or after the normal classes eat lunch?

21. Would you describe the resources made available to the students in ISS in 1992-93. (such as television, VCR, overhead, paper, computers or library privileges.)

22. Is there a phone, two way intercom, or emergency buzzer in the ISS room? If Yes, please describe what it is used for.

23. Does the ISS program consume a full school day? If not, what is the time frame required?

24. How would you describe the ISS program?

totally restrictive_____
(confined, and communication among students is not allowed.)

somewhat restrictive_____
(confined, yet allowed communication with teacher discretion.)

25. Does your ISS program offer incentives for reducing length of time originally assigned to ISS? If yes, please describe incentives.

_____good behavior: _____

_____

_____good school work: _____

_____

_____other: _____

_____

26. What position does your ISS director hold?

Principal_____
Vice-principal_____
Other_____

27. Does the ISS program employ a certified teacher? If yes, what subject areas?

28. Regarding In Service Training for your ISS staff, which opinion below most closely resembles your own?

The amount of In Service Training we have is

_____more than what is necessary
_____as much as is necessary
_____the very minimal amount necessary
_____below what is necessary
_____far below what is necessary

29. How would you describe the ISS teacher's relationship with the students in the ISS class?

_____authoritarian (complete control, no questions asked)

_____authoritative (control with explanation)

_____permissive (very little control)

30. Do you have an allocation in the school budget for ISS? Please itemize how expenses are distributed.

31. Please rate the emphasis that Berkeley County puts on the following qualities for ISS, with 1 being most important and 3 being least important.

_____punitive (strictly for punishment)

_____punitive/academic (punishment accompanied with the effort to proceed with academics)

_____therapeutic (effort to correct student's attitudes and behaviors)

32. How often are you required to report to the district office about the ISS program at your school?

33. Please state the desired goal for the ISS program at your school. Evaluate your progress to date in meeting this goal.

34. Are students limited to the number of times they visit ISS? If yes, what is the number.

35. Do you differentiate the number of days assigned to ISS based on the frequency or seriousness of the offense? If yes, describe in detail the offense and number of days assigned.

36. What is the maximum number of days a student can attend ISS for one offense?

What is the least amount of time a student can attend ISS for one offense?

Is there a maximum number of days , per school year, that a student can spend in ISS? If so, please specify this number.

37.

Fully describe your position, title and what your position and work responsibilities are in the school and how it relates to your role on the I.S.S. staff. For example, if you are one of the I.S.S. monitors and you also are a teacher in other areas in the school, please list all your positions and how your hours are divided. Also, please list what general functions you carry out within your I.S.S. position . (examples: counseling, monitoring, coordination-direction, or teaching instruction of the I.S.S. students) If you are full time I.S.S. please say so.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Please check the box that applies to you concerning each of the listed topics for in service training for I.S.S. staff development. Also, please add (write in) any additional topics not listed here that you think have been forgotten or need to be added. Space is provided for this at the bottom. Don't forget to specify for those topics you write in as to whether or not you are presently receiving training or if you think training is necessary. If you have in service staff training and also think you need more training in a particular area then check both boxes.

	presently have in service training in this area	think we need training or more training in this area
discipline		
counseling of I.S.S students		
work assignment completion and type of		

	presently have in service training in this area	think we need training or more training in this area
how to get parental involvement		
organizational coordination-between students, parents, I.S.S. teacher, and administrators		
physical location and arrangement of the I.S.S. room		
lunch for I.S.S. students		
other:		
other:		
other:		
other:		

38. Fill in the title of each member of your I.S.S. staff and specify how frequently they visit another school's I.S.S. room for observation. include yourself if you are part of the I.S.S. staff.

	I.S.S. staff member title:_____ _____ _____	I.S.S. staff member title:_____ _____ _____
never		
less than once a year		
once a year		
twice a year		
three X a year		
four X a year or more		

39. Are the regular teachers notified on a daily basis as to whether or not students are absent due to ISS? If so, please describe how they are notified.

40. Is there a Saturday school option for I.S.S. for students to catch up on their academic work?

41. Do you feel that the student teacher ratio is acceptable?

a) all of the time b) most of the time c) some of the time

d) usually not acceptable e) never acceptable

42. What attributes do you look for in hiring an I.S.S. teacher/monitor? (check all spaces which apply)

1) certification_____ 4) counselor_____
2) disciplinarian_____ 5) other_____
3) authoritarian_____

43. Do you feel that I.S.S. is accomplishing it's goals?

very successfully not successfully
1 2 3 4 5

44. Do I.S.S. teachers receive input from regular teachers?

a lot very little
1 2 3 4 5

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

45. What is the location of the I.S.S. room in the school?

TEACHER SURVEY

1. How is placement in ISS documented? Is there an agreement between the school and the parent?

2. Are the ISS students responsible for their regular classroom assignments? If no, specify the type of work the student is given to do during ISS.

3. Are there any audio or visual aides provided for the ISS students? Please indicate which type.

4. Are the ISS students separated from each other during lunch?

5. Are the ISS students separated from the non-ISS students during lunch?

6. Do the ISS students eat prior to , during, or after the normal classes eat lunch?

7. Would you describe the resources made available to the students in ISS in 1992-93. (such as television, VCR, overhead, paper, computers or library privileges.)

8. Is there a phone, two way intercom, or emergency buzzer in the ISS room? If Yes, please describe what it is used for.

9. Does the ISS program consume a full school day? If not, what is the time frame required?

10. How would you describe the ISS program?

totally restrictive_____
(confined, and communication among students is not allowed)

somewhat restrictive_____
(confined, yet allowed communication with teacher discretion)

11. Does your ISS program offer incentives for reducing length of time originally assigned to ISS? If yes, please describe incentives.

_____good behavior:_____

_____

_____good school work:_____

_____

_____other:_____

_____

12. Regarding In Service Training for your ISS staff, which opinion below most closely resembles your own?

The amount of In Service Training we have is:

_____more than what is necessary
_____as much as is necessary
_____the very minimal amount necessary
_____below what is necessary
_____far below what is necessary

13. How would you describe the ISS teacher's relationship with the students in the ISS class?

_____authoritarian (complete control, no questions asked)

_____authoritative (control with explanation)

_____permissive (very little control)

14. Please rate the emphasis that Berkeley County puts on the following qualities for ISS, with 1 being most important and 3 being least important.

_____punitive (strictly for punishment)

_____punitive/academic (punishment accompanied with the effort to proceed with academics)

_____therapeutic (effort to correct student's attitudes and behaviors)

15. How often do you visit another schools I.S.S. room for observation? Please respond accordingly.

never_____ less than once a year_____ once a year_____

twice a year_____ three times a year_____

four times a year or more_____

16.

Fully describe your position, title and what your position and work responsibilities are in the school and how it relates to your role on the I.S.S. staff. For example, if you are one of the I.S.S. monitors and you also are a teacher in other areas in the school, please list all your positions and how your hours are divided. Also, please list what general functions you carry out within your I.S.S. position . (examples: counseling, monitoring, coordination-direction, or teaching instruction of the I.S.S. students) If you are full time I.S.S. please say so._____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Please check the box that applies to you concerning each of the listed topics for in service training for I.S.S. staff development. Also, please add (write in) any additional topics not listed here that you think have been forgotten or need to be added. Space is provided for this at the bottom. Don't forget to specify for those topics you write in as to whether or not you are presently receiving training or if you think training is necessary. If you have in service staff training and also think you need more training in a particular area then check both boxes.

	presently have in service training in this area	think we need training or more training in this area
discipline		
counseling of I.S.S students		
work assignment (completion and type)		
how to get parental involvement		

	presently have in service training in this area	think we need training or more training in this area
organizational coordination-between students, parents, I.S.S. teacher, and		
administrators		
physical location and arrangement of the I.S.S. room		
lunch for I.S.S. students		
other:		
other:		
other:		
other:		

17. Do you feel that the student teacher ratio is acceptable?

_____all of the time

_____most of the time

_____some of the time

_____usually not acceptable

____never acceptable

18. Do you feel that I.S.S. is accomplishing it's goals?

very successfully not successfully

1 2 3 4 5

19. Do I.S.S. teachers receive input from regular teachers?

a lot very little

1 2 3 4 5